

Steering Committee:

Dwayne Bohac, Chairman
Alma Allen, Vice Chairman

Rafael Anchia
Angie Chen Button
Joe Deshotel

John Frullo
Donna Howard

Ken King
Brooks Landgraf
J. M. Lozano

Eddie Lucio III
Ina Minjarez

Andrew Murr
Joe Pickett
Gary VanDeaver

HOUSE RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

daily floor report

Wednesday, August 09, 2017
85th Legislature, First Called Session, Number 16
The House convenes at 10 a.m.

Two bills are on the daily calendar for second-reading consideration today:

SB 5 by Hancock	Modifying processes and penalties related to voting by mail	1
HB 331 by S. Davis	Requiring reappraisal of certain property damaged in a disaster	10

The House also is scheduled to consider three bills on third reading.

The following House committees were scheduled to hold public hearings today: Human Services in Room E2.030 at 8:30 a.m.; Criminal Jurisprudence in Room E2.014 at 10:30 a.m. or on adjournment; Pensions in Room E2.012 at 10:30 a.m. or on adjournment; and Land and Resource Management in Room E2.026 at 11:30 a.m. or on adjournment.



Dwayne Bohac
Chairman
85(1) - 16

SUBJECT: Modifying processes and penalties related to voting by mail

COMMITTEE: Elections — favorable, without amendment

VOTE: 4 ayes — Laubenberg, R. Anderson, Fallon, Swanson
2 nays — Israel, Reynolds
1 absent — Larson

SENATE VOTE: On final passage, July 26 — 21-10 (Garcia, Hinojosa, Menéndez, Miles, Rodríguez, Uresti, Watson, West, Whitmire, Zaffirini)

WITNESSES: *On House companion bill, HB 184:*
For — Aaron Harris, Direct Action Texas; Erin Swanson, Harris County Clerk's Office; Alan Vera, Harris County Republican Party Ballot Security Committee; Sandra Crenshaw, Lacpac; Kara Sands, Nueces County Clerk's Office; Chris Davis, Texas Association of Elections Administrators; Bill Fairbrother, TRCCA, RPT; Elizabeth Bingham; Laura Oakley; Colleen Vera; Matthew Walbeck; (*Registered, but did not testify*: Adam Cahn, Cahnman's Musings; Cary Roberts, County and District Clerks' Association of Texas; Jim Reaves, Texas Farm Bureau; Bill Peacock, Texas Public Policy Foundation; Donna Teeter)

Against — Yannis Banks, Texas NAACP; (*Registered, but did not testify*: Elizabeth Montgomery; Whitney Peek)

On — Glen Maxey, Texas Democratic Party; Jonathan White, Office of the Attorney General; (*Registered, but did not testify*: Cinde Weatherby, League of Women Voters of Texas; Keith Ingram, Texas Secretary of State)

BACKGROUND: Election Code, ch. 82 establishes eligibility for early voting and allows early voting by mail by those who are 65 years old or older, have certain disabilities, are out of the county on election day and during the time in which voters may vote early in person, and are in jail but otherwise eligible.

DIGEST: SB 5 would create a new criminal offense for election fraud, revise other offenses relating to mail ballots and increase certain penalties, adjust the process for verifying signatures on mail ballots and for retaining certain election records, and require the attorney general to be notified of rejected ballots.

New offense for election fraud. SB 5 would create a new crime called election fraud. The offense would be committed if a person knowingly or intentionally made any effort to:

- influence the independent vote of another in the presence of the ballot or during the voting process;
- cause a voter registration application, ballot, or vote to be obtained or cast under false pretenses; or
- cause any intentionally misleading statement, representation, or information to be provided to an election official or on an application for a mail ballot, carrier envelope, or other official election-related document.

The offense would be a class A misdemeanor (up to one year in jail and/or a maximum fine of \$4,000). Penalties would be increased to the next higher category if the offense involved a voter 65 years old or older, the person committed another such offense in the same election, or the person had a previous conviction for a crime under the Election Code.

Offenses, penalties related to mail ballots. SB 5 would revise penalties for several offenses that relate to applying for a mail ballot and voting by mail and would modify elements of some offenses, including the circumstances under which certain offenses do not apply.

Information on ballot application. SB 5 would expand the current offense of knowingly providing false information on applications for mail ballots. It would be an offense to intentionally cause false information to be provided on an application, to knowingly submit an application for a mail ballot without the knowledge or authorization of the voter, and to knowingly alter information provided by the voter.

These ballot-by-mail offenses would be state-jail felonies (180 days to

two years in a state jail and an optional fine of up to \$10,000), and the bill would remove current provisions that make it a class A misdemeanor if the person committing the crime was the applicant, related to the applicant, or registered to vote at the same address as the applicant. Penalties would be increased to the next higher category if the offense involved a voter 65 years old or older, the person committed another such offense in the same election, or the person had a previous conviction for a crime under the Election Code.

Assisting voter with carrier envelope. SB 5 would amend who had to provide certain identifying information when assisting a voter by depositing in the mail the carrier envelope used to send a voted ballot to election officials. It would require the same information from those who assisted a voter by obtaining a carrier envelope.

The penalties for offenses involving unlawful carrier envelope actions would be increased from a class B misdemeanor (up to 180 days in jail and/or a maximum fine of \$2,000) to a class A misdemeanor. SB 5 also would revise the criteria under which a person does not commit an offense to include someone physically living in the same place as the voter, rather than someone registered to vote at the same address.

Returning marked ballots. SB 5 would revise the conditions under which the current offense relating to illegally possessing an official ballot or carrier envelope do not apply. Unless a person possessed the ballot or envelope with intent to defraud, the offense would not apply to someone physically living in the same place as the voter, rather than to someone registered to vote at the same address.

The bill also would revise current provisions that make the offense not apply to someone who both possesses a carrier envelope to deposit in the mail and has followed requirements for signing the envelope. Under SB 5, the offense would not apply to a person possessing either a ballot or carrier envelope solely to lawfully assist a voter eligible for assistance and who complied with Election Code provisions on assisting voters and signing the carrier envelope.

SB 5 also would revise penalties for offenses related to possessing ballots

or carrier envelopes provided to another. Rather than penalties increasing based on the number of ballots or envelopes possessed, offenses would be class A misdemeanors, with the penalty increasing to a third-degree felony (two to 10 years in prison and an optional fine of up to \$10,000) if the ballot or envelope was possessed without the voter's request.

The bill would increase penalties to the next higher category if the offense involved a voter 65 years old or older, the person committed another such offense in the same election, or the person had a previous conviction for a crime under the Election Code.

Assisting voters with mail ballots. SB 5 would authorize voters who were disabled and physically unable to mail a ballot to select someone to deposit the sealed carrier envelope in the mail.

The penalty for unlawfully assisting a voter would rise from a class A misdemeanor to a state-jail felony. Penalties would increase to the next higher category if the offense involved a voter 65 years old or older, the person committed another such offense in the same election, or the person had a previous conviction for a crime under the Election Code.

The bill would revise the conditions under which a person does not commit the current offense of illegally assisting a voter to include someone physically living in the same place as the voter, rather than to someone registered to vote at the same address as the voter.

Illegal voting. The bill would expand the general offense of illegal voting to include voting or attempting to vote a ballot belonging to another person. The offense involving marking another's ballot would be expanded to include marking any portion of a ballot and marking a ballot without specific direction on how to mark it.

Verifying signature on mail ballots. SB 5 would expand the types of signatures that signature verification committees could use to verify that signatures on a carrier envelope and on an application for a mail ballot are of the same person. Rather than allowing only the signature on the voter registration to be used, the bill would allow the use of signatures made within the preceding six years and on file with a county clerk or voter

registrar. The bill also would allow the committee to compare signatures to determine whether they were of the same person, in contrast to current law, which prohibits the committee from using application signatures to determine that signatures were not those of the same person. Early voting ballot boards also could use previous signatures on file with a county clerk or voter registrar to determine whether signatures were of the same voter.

Notice of rejected ballots. SB 5 would require the presiding judge of the early voting ballot board to notify the attorney general of rejected ballots. The judge would have 30 days after an election to give notification of ballots rejected because the voter was deceased, the voter already voted in person in the same election, the signatures on the carrier envelope and ballot application were not executed by the same person, the carrier envelope certificate did not have a witness signature, or the carrier envelope certificate was improperly executed by an assistant.

Retaining precinct election records. SB 5 would require that all precinct election records be preserved for at least 22 months after election day, rather than the current requirement under which records involving elections for federal office are preserved for 22 months and records in other elections are retained for at least six months.

Effective date. The bill would take effect December 1, 2017, and would apply only to offenses committed on or after that date.

**SUPPORTERS
SAY:**

SB 5 would strengthen the laws governing mail-in ballots to restore and maintain the integrity of Texas elections. Vote fraud by mail is a problem in Texas, with reports of voters receiving mail ballots they did not request, forgeries on mail ballot applications, and ballot harvesting in which someone fraudulently collects and casts others' ballots. Many of these issues have been raised in the recent allegations of irregularities and election fraud in Dallas and Tarrant counties. SB 5 would help protect the right to vote by giving authorities more tools to combat problems with voting by mail.

The bill would create a new offense for election fraud to fill a gap in current law and cover situations in which vote harvesters or others try to harm the integrity of an individual's vote. This would give those voting by

mail similar protections to those voting in a polling place. The illegal actions would have to be done knowingly or intentionally to ensure that they applied only to those purposefully violating the law and did not encompass everyday situations in which no fraud was intended.

SB 5 would establish tougher penalties for many offenses related to mail voting to deter ballot fraud and to properly punish those who violate the law. Current remedies are not adequate because most offenses are punished as misdemeanors, which can amount to no more than a slap on the wrist for violations and which prosecutors can be reluctant to pursue. Individuals may repeatedly violate the law because offenses are lightly punished, and some offenses are handled through deferred adjudication, which could result in an individual having no record of election fraud. By increasing penalties to felonies or higher misdemeanors, SB 5 would put teeth into the law and give law enforcement authorities more leverage to go after ringleaders.

The bill would enhance penalties in appropriate situations. Vote harvesters and others often prey on the elderly, so the bill would increase penalties when victims were at least 65 years old. Repeat offenders also would face tougher sanctions, and the bill would allow prosecutors to pursue more severe penalties when someone defrauded several voters during one election. These enhancements would help in going after those organizing and paying for organized voter fraud efforts, such as vote harvesting.

SB 5 would not reduce voter turnout or suppress the votes of those voting legally, but instead would address only those trying to commit ballot fraud. Offenses related to mail ballots have intent requirements that keep them from being applied in innocent situations. Actions must be taken intentionally and knowingly, and provisions throughout the statute make offenses not apply to family members. Prosecutors would not use the law to target those legally and legitimately helping relatives.

SB 5 would help increase mail ballot security in numerous ways. The bill would give ballot boards and signature verification committees more options to verify signatures by allowing them to use signatures on file with election officials. The bill also would take the common-sense step of allowing the use of previous signatures to both confirm and deny that a

signature was that of the voter. This would help address situations such as when a ballot is taken out of a mailbox or filled out and signed by someone other than the voter. SB 5 would give officials more time to access records when combatting potential ballot fraud by creating a uniform requirement for records in all elections to be retained for 22 months. The bill also would require that the attorney general receive notification of rejected ballots, centralizing the process of collecting and analyzing such information.

SB 5 is designed to focus on certain aspects of mail ballot fraud, and other more comprehensive changes to the process could be handled through other legislation.

**OPPONENTS
SAY:**

Ballot fraud and other actions to defraud voters who are using mail ballots already are against the law, and current penalties appropriately punish these offenses.

The new crime of election fraud proposed under SB 5 would be too broad. The language would apply to anyone making an effort to "influence" the vote of another in the presence of the ballot or to efforts to "cause" someone to do something, which might be interpreted to encompass family members or roommates discussing an election in a room that also contained a ballot. Such broad language could have the unintended consequence of deterring family members from helping elderly or disabled relatives and could raise questions about whether an innocent conversation in proximity of a ballot was a crime. SB 5 should include an exception for family members under election fraud, something included in other mail ballot offenses.

The penalty increases contemplated under SB 5 would be too harsh and in some cases could put mail ballot crimes on the same felony level as violent offenses, occupying resources that would be better directed to violent offenders. Raising penalties, especially to the felony level, could deter someone from legally assisting a voter who qualified for and needed assistance, which could suppress voter turnout.

A lack of resources and the complexity of proving ballot fraud cases could be more likely sources for problems in pursuing such cases than the level of the penalties or a lack of offenses. Making crimes related to ballot fraud

felonies would not ensure that they received any more attention because they would have to compete with other felonies for investigation and prosecution resources.

OTHER
OPPONENTS
SAY:

Other, more effective and appropriate options exist to address problems with mail ballots. Revisions could be made to the application process, and mail ballot applications and envelopes could be redesigned to make them easier to read and understand. Civil or administrative penalties might be more appropriate than enhanced criminal penalties, and the bill could be amended to combat the practice of giving deceptive information to voters.

NOTES:

Rep. Goldman, the House sponsor, plans to offer an amendment to SB 5 that would make several changes to the bill, including:

- revising requirements for submitting early voting ballot applications through electronic transmission and fax and prohibiting use of electronic signatures on applications;
- allowing voters to request cancellation of an application for a mail ballot by signing an affidavit saying a mail ballot was never requested;
- changing references from "same person" to "voter" in provisions dealing with verifying signatures;
- establishing a misdemeanor penalty for intentionally accepting a ballot or causing a ballot to be accepted if it is known that it does not meet requirements;
- requiring the early voting clerk, rather than the election judge, to notify the attorney general of rejected ballots and requiring the attorney general to be notified of ballot cancellation requests;
- revising the new offense of election fraud involving a voter who was at least 65 years old so that the enhanced penalty provisions would not apply to an actor related to or living in the same place as the voter; and
- repealing Election Code, ch. 107, which established provisions for early voting in residential care facilities and was enacted by the 85th Legislature (HB 658 by Bernal, regular session) to take effect September 1, 2017.

A companion bill, HB 184 by Goldman, was reported favorably as

substituted by the House Committee on Elections on August 8.

SUBJECT: Requiring reappraisal of certain property damaged in a disaster

COMMITTEE: Ways and Means — favorable, without amendment

VOTE: 7 ayes — D. Bonnen, Bohac, Darby, Murphy, Murr, Raymond, Shine
0 nays
4 absent — Y. Davis, E. Johnson, Springer, Stephenson

WITNESSES: For — (*Registered, but did not testify:* Daniel Womack, Dow Chemical; James LeBas, Texas Apartment Association and Association of Electric Companies of Texas; Julia Parenteau, Texas Association of Realtors; Debbie Cartwright, Texas Taxpayers and Research Association; Thomas Parkinson)

Against — None

BACKGROUND: Tax Code, sec. 23.02 allows a taxing unit in an area declared to be a disaster area by the governor to authorize reappraisal of property damaged in that disaster. A tax bill for a property reappraised under this section is prorated based on how much of the tax year had passed before the disaster. A taxing unit that authorizes a reappraisal must reimburse the appraisal district for any costs imposed by the reappraisal.

DIGEST: HB 331 would require, rather than allow, the reappraisal of a property under Tax Code, sec. 23.02 if the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) estimated the property had sustained 5 percent or more damage as a result of the disaster. However, a property owner could decline the reappraisal.

The appraisal district would have to complete the reappraisal within 45 days after the governor declared the area a disaster area or as soon as practicable after FEMA completed the damage estimates. The bill would authorize the comptroller to adopt rules to administer its provisions.

This bill would take immediate effect if finally passed by a two-thirds

record vote of the membership of each house. Otherwise, it would take effect December 1, 2017, and would apply only to the reappraisal of property in a disaster area declared on or after that date.

**SUPPORTERS
SAY:**

HB 331 would ensure that property owners affected by disasters were not taxed as if the disaster had never occurred. Current law merely allows taxing units to request reappraisals, providing no guarantee that a property owner whose home or business had been wiped out would not have to pay taxes on the full value of the property, despite an immense loss. Due to its diverse geography, Texas leads the nation in the number of federally declared disasters, and this bill is one way the Legislature could provide much-needed disaster relief to property owners.

The bill would increase consistency and fairness in appraisals. Because current law does not require individual taxing units in disaster areas to conduct reappraisals, different taxing units can differ in how they value identical property that has been seriously damaged — a single property can be taxed differently by different taxing units, depending on whether the unit has requested a reappraisal.

HB 331 would limit the fiscal impact to taxing units. It would apply only to property with serious damage, as estimated by FEMA, and would affect only a portion of a tax year. The state also may provide disaster grants, which would assist taxing units that were most impacted.

**OPPONENTS
SAY:**

HB 331 could cause revenue problems for some taxing units. Many major disasters, such as hurricanes, strike late in the summer right before the close of the tax year, when the taxing unit already is low on funds. The reappraisal process required by the bill could significantly delay an already reduced revenue stream for taxing units suffering under losses from a disaster. This could cause service interruptions, especially with small taxing units that likely do not have large reserve funds.

NOTES:

According to the Legislative Budget Board's fiscal note, the bill could impose indeterminate costs to the Foundation School Fund by potentially reducing appraised values of property affected by disasters.